

to compete with the least common denominator in slave labor countries around the world and get back to the idea that we can pay our people a good decent living wage so they could provide for their families, send their kids to school and improve their standard of living.

Mr. SANDERS. The gentleman makes an extremely important point. When you hear somebody get up, and give a speech, and say that we have got to be competitive in the global economy, hang on to your wallets and start worrying very much because what the gentleman from New York [Mr. HINCHEY] is saying is that in south China the wages are approximately 20 cents an hour. Well, American workers, are you ready to compete? Do you think maybe we can get down to 18 cents an hour? We can get those jobs back. What about 15 cents an hour? To a large degree much of the discussion of the global economy is just that.

□ 1315

It is asking American workers to lower their wages, give up their benefits, sacrifice our environmental standards in order to compete with desperate Third World countries where people are working for starvation wages. I think, as Mr. HINCHEY indicates, that should not be the paradigm under which we operate. Rather, we should be asking the question, why, in this great country, do we not develop policies which create decent paying jobs for all of our workers, a national health care system guaranteeing health care to all of our people, a fair tax system which takes the burden of taxes off the middle class and asks the wealthy to start paying their fair share of taxes, educational opportunity for all. Is that Utopia? I do not think so.

I want to ask Mr. OWENS a question: Recently, all over America, in my district, you have middle class people, husbands and wives, working 40, 50, 60 hours a week to afford to send their kids to college, because they understand that without a college education the kids are not going to make it to the middle class. That is simply the truth. Without a college education you cannot make it to the middle class.

Mr. OWENS, the Republicans recently have brought forth a proposal which would cut back on college loans, college financial grants. What impact does that have on the aspirations and dreams of the people in your district?

Mr. OWENS. What the Republicans are trying to do in their attempt to fulfill their contract against America, we call it against America, they say with America, in an attempt to do the undoable and bring the budget down to a level of balance by the year 2002, they are going to try to take \$12 billion out of the student loan program.

Already we have year after year reduced the number of grants available. The poorest young people going to college, we used to provide more grants. But we have steadily reduced the number of grants, so it is very hard to qual-

ify for a grant. You have to be very poor, because the amount of Pell grants available, the amount of money available for Pell grants is very low. We have deliberately emphasized student loan programs. Because after all, you have time to pay for it after you get out of college and get a decent job. Most of our aid now is in the form of student loans.

Now the Republicans are saying the student loan program should not be subsidized at all. What we do now is while a young person is in college, the interest on the loan is paid for by the Government. That is our contribution as taxpayers towards the student loan program. The students get out, pick up the loan, and they start paying the interest and principal until it is paid off. But the interest during the time they are in college is paid for by the Government, and if you take that away, that raises the amount the students owe. They are expecting to save \$12 billion out of the hides of the students when we want to encourage more people to go to college. That is the one answer to our economy, to become more and more sophisticated and educated.

Mr. SANDERS. If we could perhaps wrap it up, I think, in conclusion, the point that we are trying to make, we as three or four members of the Progressive caucus, and there are 36 other members, is that we think to a large degree the Congress of the United States is out of touch with the needs of working people, middle income people, and is here to a large degree to represent the interests of the wealthy and the powerful. We think that much of what is in the Contract With America benefits the people who go to the \$1,000 a plate fund-raising dinners. We think there are sensible public policies we can develop—we brought forth some of them this afternoon—that in fact we can raise the standard of living for American people, give people hope for the future, where today there is no hope.

I want to thank both the gentleman from New York, Mr. OWENS and Mr. HINCHEY, for joining me. We will do this again.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

BARBARIANS AT THE GATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, we just returned from recess this week, and it is a fairly slow week here in the Congress. But next week we will move into the process of finalizing the budget for the coming budget year, which begins

October 1. It is a situation which I am quite concerned about.

There is a kind of calm around here before the storm. As far as I am concerned, I feel a sense of dread before a massacre takes place, because that is what I feel is in store; a massacre of very useful programs is about to occur in this budget finalization process that is going to start next week.

We already have a \$17 billion rescission package. The majority party, the Republicans in this House, have already reached into this year's budget and pulled back \$17 billion, mostly from very good programs. So \$17 billion is being cut out of the budget that is now in process, now going on.

The budget year that will end on September 30, they are trying to take out \$17 billion. The Senate has passed their version of the rescission package, and a conference is about to occur. There is nothing to feel optimistic about there. They put back a few vital items. I heard the Senate is going to restore the Summer Youth Employment Program. The Summer Youth Employment Program employs millions of young people across the country every summer. That had been wiped out by the Republican-controlled House rescission budget. Now the Senate says they will put it back, and I hope that they do restore that.

But I hope the President vetoes the whole bill. I hope that he understands there are numerous other cuts in that same \$17 billion package, for instance, the cutting of the Department of Housing and Urban Development to the tune of \$7 billion. You cut \$7 billion out of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and most of the money that is cut is for low income housing. I hope that the President will veto the whole package. But I dread what is going to happen with that package, that rescission package.

But beyond that, I dread the budget finalization process, because what has happened with the rescissions package is a preview of coming attractions, a preview of where this majority in this House is going.

It is not exaggerating to say that we are about to behold something similar to a group of barbarians burning down a city. It is not exaggerating, because we are going to destroy, and maybe this is a serious flaw, a serious weakness in the Constitution of the United States, that a party in power for 2 years can wreck havoc. It can destroy a great deal.

You can destroy the Department of Education by just denying funding. You can vote the funding out. It is difficult to vote down the authority for the agency, but if you don't fund it, you can destroy it, or so cripple it, until no matter who comes into power the next year, they will have to try to rebuild a crippled agency.

That has been the history of the Department of Education. It has always been a crippled agency. It came into

being with great controversy. Thank God Jimmy Carter created the Department of Education finally. But during the years of Ronald Reagan they tried to destroy the Department of Education, and it has never been able to function fully. But finally it has begun to function and do the kinds of things it needs to do in terms of leadership.

The threat now is in the process of cutting the budget, one of the items that is being targeted by the Republican majority is the Department of Education. We are going to eliminate the Department of Education, in an age when high technology is so important, in an age when we say that every worker, every student, should strive to go to college, and in order to do that they have to come out of high school with the best possible education in order to get a decent job and function in a very complex society. At this time we are hearing leaders in this House talk about eliminating the Department of Education.

An invaluable piece of our civilization is about to be assaulted in this budget making process. A way of life created for Americans by Americans is about to be wrecked. That is how serious this year is.

Why is this year so different from any other? Because the majority party in the House, which is the same as the majority party in the Senate, have made it clear that they want to assault many of the programs that have been created over the last 60 years. They want to get rid of what has been painstakingly developed since Franklin Roosevelt's days. They want to get rid of the kinds of programs that make our society as great as it is. They want to get rid of the kinds of programs that reach out and say to every American that our great wealth, the fact that we are the wealthiest Nation that ever existed in the history of the world, is to be shared not equally, and we are not communists, we are not proposing that everybody should have an equal share, but we are proposing that everybody should have some share of it and some kind of decent living as a result of a prosperous America.

Now there is a barbaric philosophy. And I want to just pause for a minute and say I would like to see us lower our voices and use less extremist language. So I do not want to call my colleagues who propose these doctrines barbarians. I think that is a little extreme. I just want to focus on each act. A decent person can be guilty of a barbaric act. So you have some decent people who, I will not question their decency in general, but they are subscribing to barbaric policies, barbaric actions.

Let me give you one or two examples, and I will come back in more detail later on. It is a barbaric action to propose that we fund a *Seawolf* submarine for about \$2.1 billion, and at the same time propose to cut the school lunch programs by about \$2 billion. There is controversy about whether the school lunch programs have been cut or not. I

think the conservative Congressional Budget Office has put that to rest. The conservative estimate of the conservative Congressional Budget Office is at least \$2 billion will be cut from the program. It will lose that much over the 5-year period it is being proposed. So at least \$2 billion. I think it will be more like \$6 billion, but we will take the more conservative estimate.

You are going to cut school lunches by \$2 billion, hungry kids will have less food, and at the same time propose to build a *Seawolf* submarine. What is a *Seawolf* submarine and what does it contribute to anything? Nothing. A *Seawolf* submarine would have been useful in a way with the Soviet Union. But the Soviet Union doesn't exist anymore. No other nation has these submarines.

What I am trying to do is bring this down to a level where it can be clearly understood. When I say a barbaric act has taken place when you propose to fund an obsolete weapon like a *Seawolf* submarine at the cost of \$2.1 billion, while at the same time cutting school lunches by a like amount, that is a barbarian's reasoning at work. There is no sense, no compassion.

What will the *Seawolf* submarine do for America? It can do nothing now. It could have been very useful in a war with the Soviet Union. They have very sophisticated submarines; therefore, we had to prepare a more sophisticated submarine. We already have *Seawolf* submarines. Why build one more? The cold war has been over for several years. The Soviet Union is not building any more submarines.

This submarine cannot be used for peaceful purposes. If you do not use it for warfare, you can take the kids on a ride under the sea, you could put it in New York harbor and use it as a tourist attraction. But that is too dangerous. They will not use submarines for tourist attractions, because even the best submarine is risky to the point where you wouldn't take kids for joy rides underneath the sea. So it has no peaceful purpose. yet we are going to build another *Seawolf* submarine.

We are going to continue funding the Central Intelligence Agency to the tune of at least \$28 billion, at least \$28 billion. We do not know, because it is still secret. The Soviet Union has revealed secrets about their secret intelligence agency, but we haven't divulged the budget to the American people, so we just guess at \$28 billion. It is a barbaric act to say we should continue the funding of the CIA at that level, while at the same time you cut the Summer Youth Employment Program, a program that provides jobs for youth during the summer and costs so much less. It is a barbaric act.

□ 1330

I will come back with more examples later on. But this is what we are up against.

I said that we have high-technology barbarians in charge in the House. I

would like to retract that and say that the people are not barbarians because they certainly love their families; they do a lot of things that are decent every day. It is not that they are barbarians, but they are committing barbaric acts. We need to pinpoint each act one by one.

In New York City, we have some barbaric philosophy that has been proposed recently. We have this epidemic of barbarity in public service breaking out all over in New York State government, New York City government. We are proposing to give huge tax cuts to the rich while we are cutting programs for Medicare and Medicaid already.

The mayor of New York, I think, has expressed it openly. He has said what most of the leaders in the House of Representatives have not been willing to say. The mayor of New York has come right out and said it:

Poor people, if they would please get out of town, get out of town and we will not have to be bothered with them. We would like to have policies which do not encourage poor people to stay around.

The mayor of New York City actually came out and said that. In the process of saying he did not say it, he kept saying things which were just as horrible, that as you cut programs and you squeeze neighborhoods and you refuse to build more housing and you cut the hospitals and you make life unbearable for poor people, let them get out of town, let them go. That is the kind of economic cleansing, it is a new statement by a public official of what many others are thinking but they are not stating.

We had a gentleman named Roger Star who was prominent in city civic circles and once served on the editorial board of the New York Times even who years ago said we should pursue a policy of ethnic, of planned shrinkage, that New York City should pursue a policy of planned shrinkage. That is, do not build any housing for the poor, do not bother to create infrastructures in a poor neighborhood for new sewer systems and new water systems, et cetera, do not do those things and do not build and, therefore, you plan, as a result of pursuing those policies, there will be a shrinkage of the city. As you shrink the city and the number of people in it, certainly the number of poor people, the responsibilities of the city go down and you can give tax cuts to the rich and take care of them as a result.

That was a private citizen making that statement. It was horrible enough then, but now we have the mayor of the city, the mayor who was elected by the people to govern all of the people. As you know, we know as elected officials here in the Congress, once we are elected, we are no longer elected to serve the people who elected us or the members of our party, we are elected to serve everybody. This mayor is openly saying that he really does not want to take care of a large part of the population of New York City.

Economic cleansing has been openly admitted, the philosophy. That is a barbaric philosophy. The thinking is barbaric; the policy is barbaric. I will come back to that later on.

What I am trying to say here is that I want to emphasize that the budget-making process that we are about to undertake is the most important thing that this Congress does. It is the most important event that happens in Washington. The budget-making process in any government is very important. I have used the example before of the British Government; the BBC, the British Broadcasting Corporation takes several days, used to take several days to just discuss the national budget. Nothing is more important than the budget-making process, whether you are making budgets at the Federal level or you are making the budget, going through the budget making-process at the State level or the city level.

Citizens should pay close attention because how we spend our money shows what our priorities are, how we spend our money shows what our values are. And how we spend our money determines whether our side is going to function properly or not. So in the budget-making process, all things that are most important to government and society are in motion at that time. Everything of value will be impacted by the budget process. And the budget process takes place first, but the appropriations process follows that and the two are inseparable.

The budget process sets general guidelines, the appropriations process spells out the details and they cannot be separated. The budget and appropriations process are the most important functions of our Government or any other government.

How and why is this budget and appropriations process different from all others? I have said it is different from all others because in power now we have a majority that insists that America is facing a crisis. They have created a crisis atmosphere. They have created a goal that is very difficult to attain, the goal of a balanced budget by the year 2002. If you insist that we have to balance the budget by the year 2002, then you have to take some drastic measures to do that. You cannot accomplish that unless you take drastic measures to cut the existing budget, unless you bring an axe to chop down programs that were created carefully over a 50- or 60-year period.

We had the New Deal. We had the Great Society. And there is a tendency to take all of this for granted. The Great Society was sort of an offshoot of the New Deal. Lyndon Johnson was a disciple of Franklin Roosevelt, and although we might criticize President Johnson for making many connections with foreign policy and with the Vietnam war, we recognize his devotion to the principles of Franklin Roosevelt as expressed through the Great Society programs: The Community Action program, the Medicaid program, the Medi-

care program; these things did not come from God directly. They did not fall out of heaven. They were created by Democratic administrations, and they represent an expression of the very best that is in America.

America, we have some things in our past and our tradition which we are not proud of, but we certainly can be proud of the tradition that is reflected in the New Deal and in the Great Society because it reflects a reaching out and a caring for all of the people of America and it was all done without a revolution. We have done more for human beings and for the citizens of our Nation without a revolution than other countries have done that had revolutions which professed to have this purpose.

But now we are engaged in a situation where in 2 years, in 2 years the people who have come to power are going to take advantage of a weakness in the Constitution. There are no safeguards in the Constitution against having a 2-year period be a period where you can destroy what was created in 60 years.

There is something wrong with our Constitution. I do not propose to talk about it now. I do not know what the remedy is, but it has just occurred to me as a result of the kind of protestations and the kind of declarations that have been made by the majority Republicans in the House this year, it just dawned on a lot of us that in 2 years you really can have a structure of the policies of the country totally turned around, totally altered. That is a great deal of change to take place in 2 years. It is revolutionary.

I have a suspicion of revolutions. We should always be suspicious of revolutions. Revolutions at best are necessary evils when there is no other alternative. Revolutions always cause almost as much harm as they do good because of the very nature of the upheaval of revolutions means that a lot of people are going to be trampled on, a lot of suffering is going to take place that would not take place if you follow an evolutionary process.

We have in America always followed an evolutionary process, even at the time of greatest crisis during the Depression, the transfer from Herbert Hoover to Franklin Roosevelt was not a revolution. It was an evolution. It was a use of the legislative process at its very best. Franklin Roosevelt did not go into the basement of the White House as Oliver North did and come up with secret plans about how to make the American Government operate in a way which was not approved by the Congress. Franklin Roosevelt came to the Congress, the New Deal legislation was passed in concert with the Congress.

Step by step we worked our way through a very difficult period. We entered World War II, and the same process was followed as we moved through the necessary processes to win World War II under the leadership of Franklin

Roosevelt and Harry Truman. So we have always moved in an evolutionary way. Sometimes you have to speed up the evolutionary process, and sometimes the approach to the evolutionary process has to be comprehensive, across the board you have to move and move fast, but to move in a way that is being proposed now, where an artificial crisis is created, an umbrella of emergency has been created. So we have a situation where extreme changes, extreme radical changes can be justified because we have created a crisis.

Who is it who said that we have to have a balanced budget by the year 2002? What economist has said that that is absolutely necessary to keep our economy healthy? Our deficit is coming down already. Our deficit has never been as great as certain European countries who are not in a panic and not making their people suffer in order to get a balanced budget within a 7-year period. Where did this come from? Olympia? Did some oracle predict that we had to have a balanced budget by the year 2002?

That is an artificial goal. A crisis that is created by setting that, the rationale for it, we still do not know. It is forcing us into a revolutionary mode. You are going to have to make \$700 billion in savings. You have to pull out of the process, out of the present budget over a 7-year period, you have to get \$700 billion.

My colleagues previously were discussing the Medicare cuts, because one of the places where you have the largest Government expenditures is in health care costs, Medicare being probably one of the highest expenditures.

Medicare is on the chopping block now because if you have to save \$700 billion over the next 5 to 7 years, where are you going to get it? It is like slick Willie Sutton who when he was asked, why do you rob banks, said that is where the money is. They are going to take it from Medicare because that is where the money is.

They are going to take it from Medicaid, too. Medicaid is a health care program for the poorest people in the country. And they are going to rob Medicaid, too. But nobody is discussing that because Medicaid does not have any defenders in this capital, in the city of Washington you do not hear from the White House any discussion of drastic cuts that are being proposed for Medicaid. You do not hear them on the Hill, here in Congress, but they are going to cut Medicaid for poor people drastically also.

Cuts are already under way in the States and in cities across America to cut health care for poor people. What is the problem when you start cutting health care for poor people? When the Medicaid program was first developed a statement was made which is still true. The statement is that there is no such thing as bargain basement, second-class health care. Health care is either adequate or it is not adequate. You

cannot have second-class, bargain basement health care, health care where you use old needles to save money because if you use old needles to give injections, you are likely to create more disease than you are to create health.

You cannot have health care where the hospitals do not wash the linen except once a week. You cannot have health care where a doctor makes a diagnosis that a patient needs a certain medication that exists and we know it exists and the doctor decides that that is too expensive for that person. That is not health care. That is making judgments about human beings that nobody should have the right to make.

So health care costs cannot be trimmed and cannot be cut without damaging the health care process. It is either adequate health care or it is not. So when Medicare cuts are made, what we are saying is we are going to give bargain basement health care to poor people and that is going to be inadequate health care. And those of us who are here, those who propose it and those who are against it, we all know that what we are doing is unethical and dangerous, but there are going to be cuts for Medicaid and there are going to be cuts for Medicare if they continue to insist, if they insist that we have to balance our budget in America by the year 2002.

Now, why does it make sense to balance the budget? They offer this homespun logic that says every family balances its budget. You know they have to balance your budget.

□ 1345

That seems like a great truth, something that Einstein might endorse, except any mother, any father, anybody in any family knows that you do not balance your budget, you do not balance your budget year by year. Your mortgage is not paid for in 1 year. Your mortgage is spread out over a long period of time. Otherwise you could not afford, you cannot pay for a house—there are some rich and famous Americans who can, but most of us cannot pay for a house in 1 year. You cannot pay for your car in the same year, either. Most of us cannot pay for a car, so you do not balance your budget.

Balanced budgets are not something that heaven smiles upon because they work in the economy. They are something invented by the Republican majority here as a great good that we should all strive for which does not exist. They say cities and States have balanced budgets. Most cities and States do not have balanced budgets, they have operating budgets that are balanced and then they have capital budgets. They take all the items, like your car and your house and things that have to be paid for over a long period of time, because they are so tremendously expensive, and they put that in a capital budget.

What this Government needs to do, if you want to have an intelligent approach to the budget, is we should have a capital budget for items that cost a

lot of money over a long period of time, and an operating budget for the items that you pay for on a yearly basis.

I would be the first to support a balanced budget operating budget if you want to propose it that way, as long as you take the capital items like the building of airports and highways, and if we need new weapon systems in the future, weapon systems are a large expenditure that come out, and you can look at it in a more intelligent way.

However, the people who are in charge now, they have the votes. They say we are going to have a balanced budget. It is dogmatic, it is not scientific, it is not logical, but they have the votes, so they have created a crisis.

I serve as the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus Alternative Committee on the Budget. We hope that we are going to be able to offer an alternative budget on the floor, and show our vision of where America should be going and how you can deal with the budget versus the vision of the majority that is in control right now. We are going to do that, despite the fact that we have been told that no budget will be allowed on the floor for discussion unless it meets the requirement that has been set forth to move toward balance.

You have to have a balanced budget, a budget which is going toward balance, by the year 2002. That means that since our budgets are really projected on a 5-year period, not a 7-year period, we have to show in our fifth year in our budget that the deficit is down to \$59 billion, which means that in 2 more years it will be eliminated completely. We are going to accept their challenge.

I am not sure what the Democratic minority is going to do as a whole, but the Congressional Black Caucus, we will accept that challenge. We will show how, even if you accept the illogical, unscientific approach of the Republican majority, you can produce a budget that will be in balance by the year 2002, and you can still do that without making large numbers of Americans suffer. You can do it without cutting Medicaid drastically; you can do it without cutting Medicare drastically. What you have to do, however, is stop the fantasy, stop the fantasy of increasing the defense budget because you identify with that in some kind of romantic way.

The defense budget cannot be increased while you are making all of these cuts. We do not need to increase the defense budget. We need to cut, instead, the \$100 billion for overseas bases. We are still supplying bases in Germany and Japan. These are prosperous nations. They can take care of their own needs if they want to man those bases, or even if they do not need the bases, they are there for the security of Europe as a whole, or the bases are there for the security of Asia as a whole, then Japan should pay their share of maintaining security in the world.

It is about time. They are rich nations, Germany and Japan. Let them pay for the security of Europe instead of an egotistical America. Our ego is costing us billions of dollars, an egotistical sense that we, we should make sure that Europe is secure by paying for the bases in Europe. We should make certain that Asia is secure by paying for the bases in Europe. Ego. That is how Tom Sawyer whitewashed the fence.

Japan and Germany stand back and they chuckle while their economies go forward, while their workers earn higher pay, they have longer vacations, their society is much more secure than ours. They chuckle at our egotism that says we must maintain bases across the world in order to guarantee security and freedom, we must have a huge Navy that guarantees the freedom of the sea lanes of the world.

Why do we have to have a huge Navy to guarantee the freedom of the sea lanes of the world? If we want the freedom and security of the sea lanes to be guaranteed, let us give more support to the United Nations and let us have all nations join together to guarantee the security and the freedom of the sea lanes of the world.

It is our ego that costs us billions of dollars in defense, while other nations sit back and let us do it and chuckle at us while they pour their resources into their economy. They pour their resources into the creation of jobs.

In our budget, if you want to insist on balancing the budget, we say to the Republican majority, then let us balance the budget by cutting those things which are not necessary, like \$100 billion in overseas bases.

We have, unfortunately, an attitude, a philosophy, that comes first. The attitude has to be confronted. We have to confront the fact that we are dealing with an elitist attitude, an attitude which says that we want an America which gets rid of all of the people who are a nuisance to those rich and famous who want to have an opportunity to make more and more money faster and faster.

We already have the largest corporations in the world. The Fortune 500 corporations are bigger than most of the countries in the world, their budgets. They have more money, more assets than most of the countries in the world. We already have more billionaires than any other country in the world. We do not have maybe the richest person in the world, maybe Japan or Germany might have him, but we have more people in the category of billionaires than any other nation in the world, yet we want to set conditions which will guarantee that they get rich faster, instead of setting conditions and making policies that guarantee that the pie is shared.

All of us participated in the building of America. Every soldier that died in every war made a contribution. Every person that worked in the factories during the war made a contribution.

Every engineer that took the work of a genius and translated it into some practical application, you know, everybody participated in the building of this civilization and this society.

Everybody deserves some rewards. Not everybody deserves to be rich, but everybody deserves to have a decent opportunity to pursue happiness, the right to the pursuit of happiness. We have forgotten that it is our duty as a government to supply the right to pursue happiness.

Let us just take a moment to look at the study that was reported in the New York Times on Monday, April 17. The study was reported, and I also have an editorial, and I am not sure if it was on the same day, but it was either on the following day or the same day. On Monday, April 17, the article said "The gap in wealth in the U.S. is called the widest in the West."

In the previous special order with my colleagues, I mentioned this, and they talked about it, too, we have a situation where the United States has replaced Great Britain as being the nation where the gap between the rich and poor is the widest. There is a chart which shows that over the years, since 1925, in Great Britain, the gap between the wealthiest people and the poorest people has come down steadily, while the gap in America has risen steadily, and we are way above the British at this point. The gap between the average income of the richest and the poor is wider in America than it is in Germany, in Japan, or anywhere else in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I will include this article which appeared in the New York Times on April 17 for the RECORD:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 17, 1995]

GAP IN WEALTH IN THE UNITED STATES
CALLED WIDEST IN WEST

(By Keith Bradsher)

WASHINGTON, April 12.—New studies on the growing concentration of American wealth and income challenge a cherished part of the country's self-image: They show that rather than being an egalitarian society, the United States has become the most economically stratified of industrial nations.

Even class societies like Britain, which inherited large differences in income and wealth over centuries going back to their feudal pasts, now have greater economic equality than the United States, according to the latest economic and statistical research, much of which is to be published soon.

Economic inequality has been on the rise in the United States since the 1970's. Since 1992, when Bill Clinton charged that Republican tax cuts in the 1980's had broadened the gap between the rich and the middle class, it has become more sharply focused as a political issue.

Many of the new studies are based on the data available then, but provide new analyses that coincide with a vigorous debate in Congress over provisions in the Republican Contract With America.

Indeed, the drive by Republicans to reduce Federal welfare programs and cut taxes is expected, at least in the short term, to widen disparities between rich and poor.

Federal Reserve figures from 1989, the most recent available, show that the wealthiest 1 percent of American households—with net

worth of at least \$2.3 million each—owns nearly 40 percent of the nation's wealth. By contrast, the wealthiest 1 percent of the British population owns about 18 percent of the wealth there—down from 59 percent in the early 1920's.

Further down the scale, the top 20 percent of Americans—households worth \$180,000 or more—have more than 80 percent of the country's wealth, a figure higher than in other industrial nations.

Income statistics are similarly skewed. At the bottom end of the scale, the lowest-earning 20 percent of Americans earn only 5.7 percent of all the after-tax income paid to individuals in the United States each year. In Finland, a nation with an exceptionally even distribution of income, the lowest-earning 20 percent receive 10.8 percent of such income.

The top 20 percent of American households in terms of income—\$55,000 or more—have 55 percent of all after-tax income.

"We are the most unequal industrialized country in terms of income and wealth, and we're growing more unequal faster than the other industrialized countries," said Edward N. Wolff, an economics professor at New York University. He will publish two papers in coming months that compare wealth patterns in Western countries.

Liberal social scientists worry about poor people's shrinking share of the nation's resources, and the consequences in terms of economic performance and social tension.

Margaret Weir, a senior fellow in government studies at the Brookings Institution, called the higher concentration of incomes and wealth "quite divisive," especially in a country where the political system requires so much campaign money.

"It tilts the political system toward those who have more resources," she said, adding that financial extremes also undermined the "sense of community and commonality of purpose."

Robert Greenstein, executive director of the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, a Washington research group, observed, "When you have a child poverty rate that is four times the average of Western European countries that are our principal industrial competitors, and when those children are a significant part of our future work force, you have to worry about the competitive effects as well as the social-fabric effects."

Conservatives have tended to pay less attention to rising inequality, and some express skepticism about the statistics of their significance. Marvin H. Koters, an economist at the American Enterprise Institute here, said he thought the gap, as measured, was being used as a false villain. "I think we have important sociological problems," he said, "but I don't think this gets at it all that well."

Murray L. Weidenbaum, professor of economics at Washington University in St. Louis and chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers under President Ronald Reagan in 1981-1982, said he thought the measures tended to overstate the gap by overlooking Government programs like food stamps or Medicaid.

Still, he said he was uncomfortable with greater concentration of wealth "unless there's a rapid turnover" in which "this year's losers will be next year's winners."

He noted that many wealthy people have bad years and that a lot of middle-class people, like graduate students, briefly look statistically as if they are starving. The United States does have "very substantial mobility," he added.

Mr. Weidenbaum said he doubted that the Republican agenda, if it became law, would have any substantial effect on the gap. He added that the "static" impact might be

somewhat more concentration, but that the "dynamic" impact would produce a bigger economic pie for all to share.

There is no agreement as to why inequality is rising faster in the United States than elsewhere. Explanations include falling wages for unskilled workers as automation spreads, low tax rates on the rich during the 1980's, relatively low minimum wages, the decline of trade unions and the rapid rise in the 1980's of the stock and bond markets, in which rich people are heavily invested.

The most common view seems to be that the United States has witnessed the more extreme effects of several international trends toward greater economic inequality. "While many of the countries experienced many pieces of inequality, the United States is the one country that seems to have experienced all the pieces," said Peter T. Gottschalk, an economics professor at Boston College.

Mr. Wolff's papers are based on data that run through 1989. But Census Bureau figures show that the trend toward greater income inequality continued during the first year of the Clinton Administration. While incomes rose for the most affluent two-fifths of the nation's households as the economy expanded in 1993, the rest of the country suffered from falling incomes, after adjusting for inflation.

"U.S. wage distribution is more unequal than other countries and we do less in terms of tax and transfer policy" to cushion the disparities, said Timothy M. Smeeding, an American who is director of the Luxembourg Income Study Project. Mr. Smeeding is writing two papers drawing international comparisons of income.

The project, based in Walferdange, Luxembourg, is supported by the national science foundations of nearly two dozen countries including the United States, and has gathered Government data from the member nations showing that the United States has the greatest inequalities in income distribution.

Most economists believe that wealth and income are more concentrated in the United States than in Japan. But while data show that wealth is more equitably distributed in Japan, the Government there has not released enough detailed information to make statistical comparisons possible.

Anecdotal information strongly suggests that Japan has a more equal distribution of income. The chief executives of Japanese manufacturing companies, for example, make an average of 10 times the pay of their workers. American chief executives in manufacturing are paid 25 times more, according to a 1994 study by Towers Perrin, a management consulting company.

Professor Gottschalk said Canada and the Netherlands seemed to have avoided the trend toward relatively higher wages for high-skilled workers because they had sharply increased the number of college graduates. But other trends toward inequality, like a widening wage gap between experienced and inexperienced workers, have affected these two countries, as well.

The time American inequality began to increase is also debated, with various economists putting it anywhere from the mid-1970's to the early 1980's. The double-digit inflation and stock market slumps that followed the quadrupling of oil prices in 1973 temporarily produced greater equality, as the stocks and bonds of the rich lost value. But that effect gradually disappeared, with Mr. Wolff's data showing that the concentration of wealth among the richest has consistently exceeded Britain's level since 1978. British records are especially complete, making such comparisons easier.

The comparison with Britain is all the more striking because President Reagan and

former Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher pursued broadly similar economic policies in the 1980's.

Rising housing prices have helped the British middle class and limited the growth in inequality there. Still, Mr. Gottschalk said most evidence indicated that income inequality rose much faster in the United States and Britain than elsewhere.

Richard V. Burkhauser, an economics professor at Syracuse University, said that in studying thousands of people in Germany and the United States over seven-year periods in the 1980's, he found that the two countries had roughly the same level of social mobility.

As part of the Contract With America's tax provisions, the House on April 5 approved an increase in individuals' exemptions from the estate tax, which is the main Federal tax on wealth. By the Treasury's estimate, this could cut in half the number of people subject to the tax, to one-half of 1 percent of the estates of those dying each year.

Republicans have argued that the overall tax-cut provisions would reduce annual tax bills by roughly equal percentages for rich and poor. Democrats say that because the annual tax bills of rich Americans are much larger, reducing them by about the same percentage means that most of the money goes to the rich rather than the poor or the middle class, further concentrating wealth and income.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I will read from the editorial a few excerpts that I did not have a chance to cover before. The New York Times is not a radical publication. The New York Times editorial says the following: "After years of little change, inequality exploded in America starting in the 1970's. According to Prof. Edward Wolff of New York University, three-quarters of the income gains during the 1980's and 100 percent of the increased wealth went to the top 20 percent of the families." In America, the top 20 percent got three-quarters of all the income gains. The 80 percent on the bottom, 8 out of 10, shared the rest.

I continue the quote from the New York Times: "The richest 1 percent of households control about 40 percent of the nation's wealth." One percent versus 99 percent. The other 99 percent take the rest. "... 1 percent control 40 percent of the nation's wealth—twice as much as the figure in Britain, which has the greatest inequality in Western Europe."

In Britain, which used to have the greatest inequality between the rich and the poor, now we have twice as much inequality in the New World, in America. We fought the British, we got rid of that system, that privilege and wealth. Now we have twice as much inequality as Britain.

"In Germany," and I am quoting from the New York Times editorial, "High-wage families earn about 2.5 times as much as low-wage workers," 2.5 times. The number in Germany has been falling. In America the figure is that the high-wage families in America earn four times as much as low-wage families, and the high-wage families' percentage of income is rising.

The difference between the high-wage families and the low-wage families, people who work every day for wages,

we are not talking about wealthy people who have stocks and bonds and they get their income from their investments, we are talking about wage earners, people who work every day, the highest wages in America have been going up for the top and down for the bottom, so you have the top wage earners, the difference is four times as great.

I continue to read from the editorial in the New York Times: "The best guess about the factor behind the burgeoning inequality is technology; the wage gap between high- and low-skilled workers in America doubled during the 1980's. College graduates used to earn about 30 percent more than high school graduates, but now they earn 60 percent more." College graduates used to earn 30 percent more than just mere high school graduates, and now they earn 60 percent more.

Why is it barbaric that the Republican budget proposals are going to cut the student loan program by \$12 billion over 5 years? Why is it a barbaric act, an act that has no vision, no logic, no science? Because you limit, when you make those kinds of cuts and make it more difficult for people to go to college, you limit the number of people who can enter the high-technology job market, and you cut off the possibilities of their earning livings at that level.

I go back to the New York Times article: "Prof. Sheldon Danziger of the University of Michigan estimates that trends in private pay rates explain about 85 percent of recent increases in inequality; Reagan-Bush tax cuts for the rich and spending cuts for the poor explain much of the other 15 percent."

However, even if government is not the main factor, and this is the New York Times, not me, I think government policies are certainly not what makes the economy, but government policies are the main factor in the way a society operates, including the economy. To quote the New York Times, "Even if government is not the main factor, it could be a part of the solution. Changes in the Canadian economy during the 1980's also hit hard at low-wage workers," changes in the Canadian economy.

In Canada, there the government stepped in to keep poverty rates on a downward path. In the United States, poverty rose, but in Canada, poverty dropped, because the government policies were used to intervene in their economy in ways to help the poor.

"House Republicans are now," and I am still quoting the New York Times, "House Republicans are now pushing the Federal budget in the wrong direction. At a time when employers are crying out for well-educated workers, the GOP proposes to cut back money for training and educational assistance. America needs better Head Start, primary and secondary education. It needs to train high school dropouts and welfare mothers. The GOP policy would leave the untrained stranded. That

would harm the Nation's long-term productivity—and further distort an increasingly tilted economy."

□ 1400

Mr. Speaker, I include the New York Times editorial in its entirety at this point in the RECORD:

THE RICH GET RICHER FASTER

The gap between rich and poor is vast in the United States—and recent studies show it growing faster here than anywhere else in the West. The trend is largely the result of technological forces at work around the world. But the United States Government has done little to ameliorate the problem. Indeed, if the Republicans get their way on the budget, the Government will make a troubling trend measurably worse.

Some inequality is necessary if society wants to reward investors for taking risks and individuals for working hard and well. But excessive inequality can break the spirit of those trapped in society's cellar—and exacerbate social tensions.

After years of little change, inequality exploded in America starting in the 1970's. According to Prof. Edward Wolff of New York University, three-quarters of the income gains during the 1980's and 100 percent of the increased wealth went to the top 20 percent of families.

The richest 1 percent of households control about 40 percent of the nation's wealth—twice as much as the figure in Britain, which has the greatest inequality in Western Europe. In Germany, high-wage families earn about 2.5 times as much as low-wage workers; the number has been falling. In America the figure is above 4 times, and rising.

Interpreting these trends requires caution. Inequality rose here in the 1980's in part because the United States created far more jobs—many low-paid—than did Western Europe. Low-paying jobs are better than no jobs. Rising inequality in the United States has also been caused in substantial part by middle-class families that moved up the income ladder, opening a gap with those below them.

About half of Americans move a substantial distance up or down the income ladder over a typical five-year period. In a mobile society, where workers rotate among high- and low-earning jobs, earning gaps are less frightening because any given job would be less entrapping.

But mobility has offset none of the increased inequality of income. Studies at the Maxwell School at Syracuse University show that mobility in America is not higher than in Germany. Nor does mobility here appear to be higher today than it was in the early 1970's.

The best guess about the factor behind burgeoning inequality is technology; the wage gap between high- and low-skilled workers in America doubled during the 1980's. College graduates used to earn about 30 percent more than high school graduates, but now earn 60 percent more. Prof. Sheldon Danziger of the University of Michigan estimates that trends in private pay rates explain about 85 percent of recent increases in inequality; Reagan-Bush tax cuts for the rich and spending cuts for the poor explain much of the other 15 percent.

But even if government is not the main actor, it could be part of the solution. Changes in the Canadian economy during the 1980's also hit hard at low-wage workers. But there the Government stepped in to keep poverty rates on a downward path. In the United States, poverty rose.

House Republicans are now pushing the Federal budget in the wrong direction. At a

time when employers are crying out for well-educated workers, the G.O.P. proposes to cut back money for training and educational assistance. America needs better Head Start, primary and secondary education. It needs to train high school dropouts and welfare mothers. The G.O.P. policy would leave the untrained stranded. That would harm the nation's long-term productivity—and further distort an increasingly tilted economy.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I just want to reemphasize something I read from the editorial earlier:

Some inequality is necessary if society wants to reward investors for taking risks and individuals for working hard and well. But excessive inequality can break the spirit of those trapped in society's cellar—and exacerbate social tensions.

We are not proposing a change in capitalism. We are not proposing an attack on capitalism. Capitalism is the way of the world. It is the best economy that mankind has been able to fashion. But capitalism should be tempered by democratic government. Democratic government should extol the necessity to make sure that there are safety nets, that the wealth is shared. When people go to work for Xerox or IBM or Microsoft, they do not take an oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States. They do not have to be true to the doctrine expressed in the Declaration of Independence. The pursuit of happiness is not a concern of a corporation, *per se*. The pursuit of happiness of the American people is not their concern. The pursuit of profit is their business. But government must make certain that in the process of pursuing profits, corporations are part of a total society and that policies are promulgated where everybody is properly taken care of, not everybody shares equally but we have public policies which guarantee that everybody will have decent housing, public policies which guarantee that the opportunity to get an education will be provided.

We cannot afford to have a budget like the budget that is about to be proposed by the Republican majority that is going to slash job training programs tremendously, they are going to slash education programs, and, of course, there is a notion existing that they may completely eradicate the Department of Education.

What does it say to the world, to the civilized world, to the other industrialized nations that the United States of America is going to eliminate the Department of Education? What does it say to the other competitors that we have in the world about our future competitiveness? I think they will chuckle and say we are going to have less of a problem with a competitive America in the future if they are going to eliminate a Department of Education at the Federal level which gives a sense of direction for education in the country as a whole.

It is not responsible, we do not have a system like France or Great Britain or most of the European countries, we do not have a centralized system of education. The education budget in

this country, most of it is paid for by State and local governments. The proportion of the budget of the Federal Government's share of the budget is about 8 percent now, fluctuating between 8 and 6 percent. Under Ronald Reagan it went down to about 6 percent. But at most it is 8 percent of the total budget. Of the more than \$360 billion spent on education from kindergarten to higher education last year, the Federal Government only paid for about 8 percent of that. So it is not our contribution financially that is so important. It is the leadership that the Federal Government offers in terms of giving a sense of direction to where we have to go in the global economy in order to be competitive. It is the leadership of the Federal Government that brought forth a document called "A Nation At Risk" where we said this Nation cannot survive unless we pay more attention to how our children are educated in order to be able to compete in the modern world. It is the leadership that led George Bush to put out America 2000, his own program for improving education.

Behind George Bush came President Clinton with Goals 2000. Goals 2000 is not so different from America 2000. They were both at the same conference where the Governors came up with the same six ways to improve education.

We were moving forward, we are moving forward in terms of Federal participation without Federal domination of education. The Federal Government offers leadership. But now I dread the budget that is coming because that budget proposes to eliminate the Department of Education. That is a barbaric act. It would be a barbaric act, an unreasonable act, an unscientific act to eliminate the Department of Education at this time.

I say the barbaric philosophy, people who are committing barbaric acts are a real danger. They are not barbarians themselves but each act should be examined by itself. I think I mentioned before a philosophy of economic cleansing that has been proposed by the mayor of New York City. The mayor of New York City is a nice guy when you get to know him. He is a decent fellow, he has a family, he has kids. I cannot call him a barbarian, but I can think of no more barbaric thinking than to believe that poor people should get out of town, they should leave, in order to make the city's economic situation better. That is barbaric in the extreme. It is a philosophy of ethnic cleansing that has been expressed by an elected official. Those who think it, I consider that bad enough, but this has been expressed and it must be challenged.

The mayor of New York City cannot say to the poor people of New York City, "You don't belong here." He cannot say to the African-Americans in New York City, "You don't belong here." New York City was a major slave port. Millions of slaves were poured into New York City in its early days. As New York City was built

starting at the waterfront and moved back up to Central Park, even when Central Park was cleared, there are photographs of slaves working to clear the ground. That city was built in its infancy by slave labor. There is a Negro burial ground that was unearthed as they were building a new Federal building in a downtown section of Manhattan, and the Negro burial ground revealed massive numbers of graves, there must have been epidemic sickness, large numbers of people died, large numbers of children died. In order for there to be so many graves and so many people dying, there had to be many slaves there and they were the ones who cut down the trees, made the lumber, did the construction. Long before the white immigrants came, the slaves who were kidnapped and who were the hostages and not immigrants, they helped to build New York City. And now to say to the descendants of those slaves who built New York City, "Get out of town, you're not wanted."

Where will they go? Where will the poor people of New York City go? Who else wants them if New York City does not want them? Will they go to Marietta, GA, where they are building the F-22 fighter plane? The F-22 fighter plane is one of those obsolete weapon systems that we do not need. We do not need a fighter plane more sophisticated than the one we already have because the Soviet Union is not building another one. We have the best already, so why build another one? It is going to cost us \$12 billion over the next 5 years to continue creating, building the F-22.

Can you give us some jobs in the F-22 plant in Marietta, GA, which happens to be the Speaker's district? Can you give us jobs for the poor of New York City? Can we send them to Marietta, GA?

Where will they go? Can we send them to Groton, CT, where they are building another *Seawolf* submarine? Can you give the poor people of New York jobs at Groton, CT, where they are building another *Seawolf* submarine?

Can they go to Texas where they made a killing? Texas is responsible for the savings and loan debacle. Half of the savings and loans that collapsed, half the swindles took place in Texas.

But they benefited even from the collapse because, since they have most of the problem in their State, the Resolution Trust Corporation and all of the effort to straighten out the debacle created by the savings and loan swindle, half of it is in Texas. So workers are hired by the Resolution Trust Corporation, by those people who are trying to straighten out the savings and loan mess. They are Texas workers, so Texas benefits twice.

Can we get some jobs for New Yorkers in Texas so that they can benefit from the savings and loan swindle, jobs that are created as we try to straighten it out? Where can the New York City poor people go?

Can they go to Kansas? In Kansas you have families who are farm families, and they have been averaging \$30,000 to \$40,000 in government checks over the last decade. According to an article in the New York Times, they get \$30,000 to \$40,000 for doing nothing, except what they do raises the price of food, and we pay more for food in New York because we are keeping the price of farm products high by subsidizing them with taxpayers' money.

There is something barbaric about paying people not to grow food and driving up the price so the poorest people have to pay more money. The farm price program was created by the New Deal, by Franklin Roosevelt, when farmers were poor, to save poor farmers, when large numbers of people lived on the land. But now we have less than 2 percent of the population of the United States living on farms, and we are spending billions of dollars to take care of those pretty well-to-do farmers and the agribusinesses.

I want to read one more editorial from the New York Times about the farm program. This is a program which we all accept nobody wants to cut. Recently the President made a trip to Iowa, and he pledged that he would defend Federal farm subsidies to the end.

The New York Times editorial says that farmers, quoting the New York Times, farmers are the Nation's richest welfare recipients.

Farmers are the Nation's richest welfare recipients. Full-time farmers typically earn four times as much as nonfarm families.

The Federal Government pays farmers and huge agribusinesses not to grow crops or send food abroad. Mr. Clinton says that is a nifty way to boost exports, but taxpayers who foot the bill might take exception.

The Federal program stifles food production, which jacks up prices and hurts both consumers and the economy. The farm program costs taxpayers about \$10 billion a year and adds an equal amount to food bills, driving up the price of milk, fruit, sugar and many other necessities by about 10 percent.

That quote was from the New York Times editorial, which is entitled "Mr. Clinton Bows to Farmers."

Many of those farmers live in Kansas, the State of Kansas. Can we send New York City's poor to Kansas to share in the welfare checks that the farmers get? Our welfare checks average no more than \$600 for a family of three a month, so surely the welfare recipients in New York would greatly benefit if they could get welfare checks at the level of the checks that are being received by the farmers in Kansas.

Mr. Giuliano should know that there is nowhere else for the poor to go. They will not take them in Kansas; in Texas; in Groton, CT; in Marietta, GA. They have a right to stay in New York City. The inhabitants have a right, the citizens have rights.

If a government cannot take care of the needs of their citizens, they cannot provide decent services, they cannot provide educational opportunities, then that government should resign. The public officials who cannot do that

should resign. Do not exhort the people to leave. That is barbaric. That is not ethnic cleansing, it is economic cleansing, since you want all the poor to go.

First we had the tax on the illegal immigrants. Then we had a tax on the legal immigrants. Now we want all poor people to go. That is barbaric. We must resist that kind of barbarism.

In closing, what I am saying is that the budget process is taking place at every level in the country. In New York State, the budget was supposed to be completed and submitted on April 1. Now it is more than a month later and it is not completed because there is a struggle under way in New York State between the elite oppressive minority—you have the same elite oppressive minority with the philosophy that the poor are expendable, that you can throw overboard certain people. You have the high-technology barbarians in control in New York State, and in New York City, in city hall you have the same philosophy in the mayor.

Yes, there are budget cuts that have to be made. Yes, there is a need to balance the budget, and Democrats should not get off the hook. We should come forward with proposals about how the budget should be balanced. We should not hesitate to talk about revenue.

In New York City, the State has always robbed the city blind in terms of revenue, doing very little for the city. They have taken far too much from the city. In New York City, you have a Port of New York City, a Port Authority of New York-New Jersey which owns all the most valuable land where the airport is and the ships dock. Revenue that ought to be going to the city is going to the Port Authority. That ought to be corrected.

In New York City, you have two- and three-family homeowners who pay taxes which are far lower, about one-fourth the taxes that are being paid by the people who live in the suburbs surrounding New York. You have a number of ways that revenue could be increased.

Yes, we do need to decrease expenditures. Yes, we do need to adjust programs. There is not a program that has ever been invented that could not be trimmed, could not be adjusted, could not be refined. All that should take place in an atmosphere of an evolutionary process, and not a revolutionary process which says that "We are going to destroy, we are going to slash and burn, we are going to have a blitzkrieg attack on all the social programs that were invented, that were developed over the last 60 years."

We do not need to go into the budget process next week with so much dread, so much fear, so much foreboding. We do not have to look forward to a process that is going to tear down and wreck the best that America has ever built.

□ 1415

It could be very different. We could go forward with a philosophy of FDR

ringing in our ears. There is nothing radical or new. The "FDR's Economic Bill of Rights," I ran across it in a magazine the other day, and I will just close with this. Franklin Delano Roosevelt said many years ago:

In our day these economic truths have become accepted as self-evident. We have accepted, so to speak, a second Bill of Rights under which a new basis of security and prosperity can be established for all regardless of station, or race or creed.

Among these are:

The right to a useful and remunerative job in the industries, or shops or farms or mines of the nation;

The right to earn enough to provide adequate food and clothing and recreation;

The right of farmers to raise and sell their products at a return which will give them and their families a decent living;

The right of every businessman, large and small, to trade in an atmosphere of freedom from unfair competition and domination by monopolies at home or abroad;

The right of every family to a decent home;

The right of adequate medical care and the opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health;

The right of adequate protection from the economic fears of old age, and sickness, and accident and unemployment;

And finally, the right to a good education.

All of these ideas were espoused by Franklin Roosevelt many years ago. You have heard the Speaker of this House quote Roosevelt and speak of him admirably as a person who created new order in our society. Why does he want to tear down an order that was created by Franklin Roosevelt as we go forward in the budget process and appropriations process? This Nation is great because carefully, painstakingly we built a system that demonstrated we care about everybody in America. Let us not let the oppressive elite minority destroy what has been put there by and for a caring majority.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF UNITED STATES DELEGATION OF MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTER-PARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REGULA). Without objection, and pursuant to the provisions of 22 U.S.C. 276h, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House as members of the United States delegation of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group for the first session of the 104th Congress: Mr. BALLENGER of North Carolina, vice chairman; Mr. GILMAN of New York; Mr. DREIER of California; Mr. SALMON of Arizona; Mr. HAYWORTH of Arizona; Mr. BROWBACK of Kansas; Mr. DE LA GARZA of Texas; Mr. GEJDESON of Connecticut; Mr. COLEMAN of Texas; Mr. MILLER of California; and Mr. RANGEL of New York.

There was no objection.